



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/599,298	06/21/2000	Scott L. Ruthfield	MS1-560US	6997
22801	7590	09/12/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			SAX, STEVEN PAUL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/599,298

Applicant(s)

RUTHFIELD ET AL.

Examiner

Steven P. Sax

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-46, 48-78 and 80-87 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-46, 48-78, 80-87 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/14/05</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. The remarks filed 6/24/05 have been entered.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless

(e) the invention was described in

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or  
(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

3. Claims 1-22, 24-32, 34-38, 40-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Koppolu et al (6460058).

4. Regarding claim 4, Koppolu et al show the single application program configured to provide the single navigable window (Figure 3, 5), multiple different functionalities to which single navigable window can be navigated by a user (column 8 lines 29-40), a navigation model that is configured to manage the user's navigation activities within the single navigation program (column 10 lines 1-29). The program is configured to provide

navigation instrumentalities associated with the single navigable window for use to navigate the window inside individual functionalities and to the different functionalities (Figures 5-7, column 11 lines 30-50, column 13 lines 55-68).

5. Regarding claim 2, the navigation model includes a navigation stack (inherent in column 10 lines 1-6, and also see column 10 lines 25-45).

6. Regarding claim 3, the navigation stack includes back and truncate stack (see Figure 5, the view/appearance and search elements).

8. Regarding claim 5, one of the navigation instrumentalities includes links associated with the different functionalities to which the single navigable window can be navigated (column 10 lines 55-67, column 13 lines 1-25 for example).

9. Regarding claim 6, one of the navigation instrumentalities includes browser like navigation buttons that can be used in conjunction with the model to navigate the window inside and between functionalities (Figure 3 the top left corner for example, note the arrow buttons).

10. Claim 7 shows the same features as in claims 5 and 6, and is rejected for the combined reasons for which those claims are rejected.

11. Regarding claim 8, a context sensitive command area is provided in which command sets are changed as different functionalities are navigated (see Figure 7 and note column 13 lines 55-67 and column 14 lines 1-14).

12. Regarding claim 9, the different functionalities include document centric functionalities (column 10 lines 37-44).

13. Regarding claims 10-11, the functionalities include: web browser (column 10 lines 20-35, column 12 lines 10-23), email functionality (column 10 lines 50-57), planner (column 11 lines 50-67), contacts (column 11 lines 8-20), word processing (column 10 lines 58-65).

14. Regarding claim 12, as demonstrated above, the functionalities enable the user to accomplish different tasks.

15. Regarding claim 13, as demonstrated above, each different task relates to a different document type (again column 10 lines 56-67).

16. Regarding claim 14, Koppolu et al show the single application program configured to provide the single navigable window (Figure 3, 5), multiple different document centric functionalities to which single navigable window can be navigated by a user (column 8 lines 29-40), a navigation stack that is configured to manage the

user's navigation activities window back and forth between different functionalities (column 10 lines 1-6 and 25-45, Figures 5-7).

17. Regarding claim 15, the navigation stack has back and truncate navigation (inherent, Figure 5).

18. Regarding claim 16, the program is configured to provide navigation instrumentalities associated with the single navigable window for use to navigate the window inside individual functionalities and to the different functionalities (Figures 5-7, column 11 lines 30-50, column 13 lines 55-68).

19. Regarding claim 17, one of the navigation instrumentalities includes links associated with the different functionalities to which the single navigable window can be navigated (column 10 lines 55-67, column 13 lines 1-25 for example).

20. Regarding claim 18, one of the navigation instrumentalities includes browser like navigation buttons that can be used in conjunction with the model to navigate the window inside and between functionalities (Figure 3 the top left corner for example, note the arrow buttons).

21. Claim 19 shows the same features as in claims 17 and 18, and is rejected for the combined reasons for which both of those claims are rejected.

22. Regarding claim 20, the email and Internet are examples of extensible functionality (column 10 lines 10-17 and 55-65).

23. Regarding claims 21-22, the program is configured to receive a module embodying functionalities via the Internet, which is a network (column 10 lines 10-17).

24. Regarding claim 24, Koppolu et al show the single application program configured to display the single navigable window (Figure 3, 5) for a user to use in navigating between multiple different functionalities provided by the single application program (column 8 lines 29-40), and to incorporate different functionalities in an extensible manner so that the user can use the single navigable window to navigate to the different incorporated functionalities (column 10 lines 1-6 and 25-45, Figures 5-7).

25. Regarding claims 25-26, the incorporated functionalities can be delivered to the program via the Internet network (column 10 lines 10-17 and 55-65).

26. Regarding claim 27, the single application program is configured to provide a navigation model to manage the user's navigation activities within the program (column 10 lines 1-29).

27. Regarding claim 28, the model is a navigation stack (inherent column 10 lines 1-

6 and 25-45).

28. Regarding claim 29, the program is configured to provide navigation instrumentalities associated with the single navigable window for use to navigate the window inside individual functionalities and to the different functionalities (Figures 5-7, column 11 lines 30-50, column 13 lines 55-68).

29. Regarding claim 30, one of the navigation instrumentalities includes links associated with the different functionalities to which the single navigable window can be navigated (column 10 lines 55-67, column 13 lines 1-25 for example).

30. Regarding claim 31, one of the navigation instrumentalities includes browser like navigation buttons that can be used in conjunction with the model to navigate the window inside and between functionalities (Figure 3 the top left corner for example, note the arrow buttons).

31. Regarding claim 32, the functionalities are document centric (column 8 lines 29-40).

32. Regarding claim 34, Koppolu et al show the network accessible single application program configured to provide the single navigable window (Figure 3, 5, column 10 lines 10-17), multiple different document centric functionalities to which single navigable



window can be navigated by a user (column 8 lines 29-40), a navigation stack that is configured to manage the user's navigation activities window back and forth between different functionalities (column 10 lines 1-6 and 25-45, Figures 5-7).

33. Regarding claim 35, the functionalities are extensible (column 10 lines 1-25).

34. Regarding claim 36, the single application program is configured to provide a navigation model to manage the user's navigation activities within the program (column 10 lines 1-29).

35. Regarding claims 37-38, the incorporated functionalities can be delivered to the program via the Internet network (column 10 lines 10-17 and 55-65).

36. Regarding claim 40, Koppolu et al show the single application program configured to provide the single navigable window (Figure 3, 5), multiple different functionalities to which single navigable window can be navigated by a user (column 8 lines 29-40), capabilities to manage the user's navigation activities window back and forth between different functionalities (column 10 lines 1-6 and 25-45, Figures 5-7). A context sensitive command area is provided in which command set contexts are changed as different functionalities are navigated (see Figure 7 and note column 13 lines 55-67 and column 14 lines 1-14), and functionalities are received and incorporated into the program (column 11 lines 20-49).

37. Regarding claim 41, Koppolu et al show the single application program configured to provide the single navigable window (Figure 3, 5), multiple different functionalities to which single navigable window can be navigated by a user to accomplish different tasks (column 8 lines 29-40). Navigation instrumentalities include browser like navigation buttons that can be used in conjunction with the model to navigate the window inside and between functionalities (Figure 3 the top left corner for example, note the arrow buttons).

38. Regarding claim 42, a context sensitive command area is provided in which command set contexts are changed as different functionalities are navigated (see Figure 7 and note column 13 lines 55-67 and column 14 lines 1-14).

39. Regarding claim 43, the navigation instrumentalities includes multiple links associated with the different functionalities to which the single navigable window can be navigated (column 10 lines 55-67, column 13 lines 1-25 for example).

40. Regarding claims 44, this shows the same features mentioned in claim 41 and is rejected for the same reasons.

41. Regarding claim 45, this shows the same features as claim 43 and is rejected for the same reasons.

42. Regarding claim 46, in addition to that mentioned for claim 4, user input indicates selection of a particular functionality, the window navigates to it and indicia to enable the user to accomplish the task (column 13 lines 10-40).

47. Regarding claim 48, if a user's activities impacts the model, an entry is manipulated (column 11 lines 1-26).

48. Regarding claim 49, an entry is removed (column 10 lines 44-48).

49. Regarding claim 50, the entry removed is one away from the present activity, that is, the last navigated entry (column 10 lines 44-48).

50. Regarding claim 51, an entry is added (column 11 lines 1-26).

51. Regarding claim 52, the navigation entries are reorganized responsive to a non-navigation action (column 11 lines 53-65).

52. Regarding claim 53, the state of the document is maintained in response to user navigation activities that take the user on a navigation path outside the direct path to the document (column 11 lines 45-65, column 12 lines 1-25).

53. Regarding claim 54, a URL is modified (column 13 lines 63-67).

54. Regarding claim 55, a title is modified (column 14 lines 1-26).

55. Regarding claim 56, an entry is modified so that it points to a location different from a previous location (column 11 lines 35-64).

56. Regarding claim 57, a navigation stack is configured to manage the user's navigation activities window back and forth between different functionalities (column 10 lines 1-6 and 25-45, Figures 5-7).

57. Regarding claim 58, displayed proximate to the window are navigation instrumentalities that enable user input selection of a functionality (column 10 lines 1-29).

58. Regarding claim 59, the navigation instrumentalities includes links associated with the different functionalities to which the single navigable window can be navigated (column 10 lines 55-67, column 13 lines 1-25 for example).

59. Regarding claim 60, the navigation instrumentalities includes browser like navigation buttons that can be used in conjunction with the model to navigate the window inside and between functionalities (Figure 3 the top left corner for example, note

the arrow buttons).

60. Regarding claim 61, a context sensitive command area is provided in which command sets are presented for a selected functionality (see Figure 7 and note column 13 lines 55-67 and column 14 lines 1-14).

61. Regarding claim 62, command sets are changed as different functionalities are navigated (see Figure 7 and note column 13 lines 55-67 and column 14 lines 1-14).

62. Claim 63 shows the same features as claim 46 and is rejected for the same reasons.

63. Claim 64 show the same features as recited in claims 59 and 60 combined, and is rejected for the same combined reasons as both of those claims.

64. Regarding claim 65, the functionalities are document centric (column 10 lines 37-44).

65. Regarding claim 66, command sets are changed as different functionalities are navigated (see Figure 7 and note column 13 lines 55-67 and column 14 lines 1-14).

66. Claims 67-71 show the same features as claims 24-27, 29 and are rejected for

the same reasons.

67. Regarding claim 72, the navigation instrumentalities includes links associated with the different functionalities to which the single navigable window can be navigated (column 10 lines 55-67, column 13 lines 1-25 for example), and browser like navigation buttons that can be used in conjunction with the model to navigate the window inside and between functionalities (Figure 3 the top left corner for example, note the arrow buttons).

68. Claims 73-75 show the same features as claims 4, 10-11 and are rejected for the same reasons.

69. Regarding claim 76, user input is received to create a new document from a plurality of document types, and the system navigates to an empty document of that type  
(column 13 lines 1-29).

70. Regarding claim 77, an entry is made in the navigation model corresponding to the new document, the model used to manage navigation activities (column 10 lines 5-36).

71. Regarding claim 78, the functionalities are associated with different document

types that can be authored by a user, the input indicates work is completed on a particular document type, and the document is published based on type (column 11 lines 45-65, column 12 lines 1-25).

72. Regarding claim 80, if a user's activities impacts the model, an entry is manipulated (column 11 lines 1-26).

73. Regarding claim 81, an entry is removed (column 10 lines 44-48).

74. Regarding claim 82, the entry removed is one away from the present activity, that is, the last navigated entry (column 10 lines 44-48).

75. Regarding claim 83, an entry is added (column 11 lines 1-26).

76. Regarding claim 84, the navigation entries are reorganized responsive to a non-navigation action (column 11 lines 53-65).

77. Regarding claim 85, the state of the document is maintained in response to user navigation activities that take the user on a navigation path outside the direct path to the document (column 11 lines 45-65, column 12 lines 1-25).

78. Regarding claim 86, a URL is modified (column 13 lines 63-67).

79. Regarding claim 80, an entry is modified so that it points to a location different from a previous location (column 11 lines 35-64).

80. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

81. Claims 23, 33 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koppolu et al (6460058) and Starr (6606606).

82. Regarding claims 23, 33, and 39, in addition to the aforementioned, Koppolu does not go into the details of the functionalities being fee based in connection with a subscriber model, but does mention reorganization of entries responsive to a non-navigation action (see paragraph 24 of this Office Action). In addition, Starr shows fee based functionalities in accordance with a subscriber model (Figure 6, column 4 lines 15-5). The use of this reorganizes entries in response to a non-navigation action. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this functionality type in Koppolu et al because it would be a convenient way to have reorganized entries in a navigation model in response to a non-navigation action.



82. Applicant's arguments filed 6/24/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner notes and appreciates the description of applicants' invention, as well as the general background of the invention. Applicants focus on the concept of the 'single application program.' This recitation of the 'single application program' then becomes applicants' main argument against the Koppolu reference. Applicants complement this by also arguing the feature of navigating the single navigable window to multiple different functionalities. In response to applicants' arguments, however, please note that even the portion of Koppolu which applicants quote on page 35 of applicants' remarks mentions the browser. This browser is in fact, a single application program, indeed with a single navigable window; furthermore, the cited portions of Koppolu as brought out in detail in the Office Action above show how this single navigable window of the browser application program may be navigated to multiple different functionalities.

Examiner has noticed in the prosecution that a possible cause for differences regarding claim interpretation lies in the functionality of browser programs and the multitude of various functionalities which may be imported from the Internet for example into the single browser window. Many times these functionalities are inherent, but in the case of Koppolu they are actually explicit, as shown in the Office Action above. All these multiple different functionalities are imported into the same browser program, even though the functionalities may be very different indeed. In fact in Koppolu, the transition is very seamless to navigate the different functionalities to the same single

navigable window of the single browser application program. Applicants' representative is invited to contact the Examiner to discuss claim interpretation.

83. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


84. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven P. Sax whose telephone number is (571) 272-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

\*\*\*

  
STEPHEN C. CAX  
PATENT EXAMINER